1	
2	O
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	WESTERN DIVISION
10	WESIERN DIVISION
11	TRACY LEE DOTSON,) Case No. CV 15-6521-CAS(AJW)
12	Petitioner,) MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
13	v.) DISMISSING PETITION
14) WITHOUT PREJUDICE DENIEL McELLER,)
15	Respondent.)
16	<i>'</i>

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, and it was transferred to this Court on August 26, 2015.

On November 18, 2015, February 16, 2016, March 16, 2016, and March 31, 206, mail addressed to petitioner was returned as undeliverable. Because more than fifteen days have passed since the service date of the returned mail, the petition is subject to dismissal based upon petitioner's failure to keep the Court informed of his current address. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); C.D. Cal. Local Rule 41-6; Carey v. Kinq, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (holding that it was not abuse of discretion to dismiss pro se plaintiff's action for failure to keep court apprised of his current mailing address as required by local rule); Uhl v. Sniff, 2016 WL 769795, at

*3 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 2, 2016) (recommending dismissal for failure to comply with Local Rule 41-6), report and recommendation adopted, 2016 WL 777866 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2016); Pickens v. Los Angeles County Sheriff Deputies, 2010 WL 1931267, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 7, 2010) (same), report and recommendation adopted, 2010 WL 1929884 (C.D. Cal. May 7, 2010). Accordingly, the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is dismissed without prejudice.1 It is so ordered. Rhristine a. Smyde Dated: <u>June 30, 2016</u> Christina A. Snyder United States District Judge

¹ In light of the dismissal of this action, respondent's motion for a more definite statement is denied as moot.